



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# CHINESE PORCELAINS.

## CHINESE PORCELAINS.



LAST December all Paris was for four days under the charm of the unique Vapereau collection of Chinese porcelains, sold at the Hôtel Drouot. According to Le Figaro, the collectors themselves, such as Grandidier, who has for forty years possessed a fine col-

lection of plates; De Goncourt, the author of "La Maison d'un Artiste;" Du Sartel, author of a standard work on Chinese porcelains; Madame Delacour, who has inherited the Poiré collection—all were astounded at the richness and variety of the extraordinary collection of little Chinese flacons or snuff-bottles. "Oh, those little flacons!" exclaimed Le Figaro. "Of how many sins of covetousness have they been the cause!" before they were finally sold off for ten thousand francs. All the curious and learned people that Paris holds passed before the cases in which they were displayed, and went into ecstasies over the one hundred and sixty-eight flacons, glazed with turquoise or sky blue, emerald green, copper green, or camellia-leaf green, truité, flambé, cendré, clouded, kidney-bean colored, mustard yellow, straw-colored, jaune impérial, and coral red—a positive *debauch* of gleaming and harmonious colors. And

then the designs, as pretty as pictures, and the chimeras, which suggested legends unknown to comparative mythology! Here was a flacon illuminated all round with a rocky landscape in which children were at play with different animals, most of them in blue underglaze, with parts in green and yellow. There was another, enriched with a flowering tree-peony engraved on a blue ground, its mouth closed by a stopper furnished with a little ivory spoon for the snuff, and with a round red stone set in chiselled copper. Another was formed by a naked infant lifting up before him with both hands a peach of longevity. Dragons, birds, bamboos, pagodas, chrysanthemums, curly-tailed dogs of Fo—all that a Chinaman's fantastic imagination might invent was there.

Le Figaro makes a point of the difference between these delicate objects of art, in which infinite beauty has been compressed into a little space, and the big "mandarin" vases and rouleaux with figures, which form the stock of the Dutch collections. "There is between them the distance which separates the merchant from the man of taste, who collects only objects of choice." Le Figaro is undoubtedly right as to snuff-bottles, for they are certainly the cream and quintessence of Chinese porcelains. But too much should not be said against the Hollanders. They were the first to import into Europe the productions of the extreme East, and it is less as a business speculation than from ignorance that they have en-

It is only within the last twenty years that the taste of amateurs and collectors of Chinese art has been purified. After the capture of Pekin by the soldiers of Palikao (a French general, though his name sounds like that of a mandarin), on the return of the French expedition, collectors perceived by the débris of the sack of the Summer Palace that these charming things which they had before been buying were, take them all together, but second rate and vulgar articles, and that there was still in China an unworked mine of artistic porcelains. Some travellers and learned people thereupon undertook the voyage to China on the strength of what they had learned or suspected from so much of this plunder as they had been privileged

to see. And there they discovered an entire new world of art, the existence of which had previously been unsuspected. No more of these porcelains manufactured by the hundred or the thousand to clog the routes of commerce! Instead, there were chefs d'œuvre of finish and of grace, single pieces, each a labor of love of the artist anxious to give to his work the most exquisite perfection and the extremest delicacy. The French Government should have presented Paris with an incomparable museum of snuff-bottles, but it contented itself with giving a few mediocre specimens to the Empress Eugénie to form part of her gallery of Chinese art at Fontainebleau.

M. Vapereau was one of those who established



DESIGN FOR A PLAQUE. "NEAPOLITAN GIRL." BY CHARLES SPRAGUE PEARCE. (SEE PAGE 100.)

cumbered the market with potiches of vast dimensions and big decorative vases. There have always been, up to the present time, more amateurs of effective things than of small objects to be kept in glass cases. Under Louis XV., Mme. de Pompadour and, later, Mme. du Barry amused themselves with decorating their boudoirs with chinoiserie, and it was due to them that these great polychromatic vases, which to-day are relegated to the ante-chamber, were considered worthy to be placed in the royal apartments. M. du Sartel tells of little intrigues put on foot to capture from this or that buyer a coveted bargain. La Fontaine and the Prince de Conti, it appears, were leagued against the Prince's friend, Du Vivier, in a matter of two "magots" which his Highness coveted.

themselves at Pekin after these discoveries. There he studied on the spot the arts of the Chinese, while teaching them European ideas of law and translating romances from the Corean, and this is how his collection came to be made. Imagine a Parisian in Pekin. The town is a miserable one, and but little amusing. He seeks the Boulevard, there is none; the Bois, it is not there. No flaneurs or people fooling away their time as at Paris! There are only two things to do: make a pilgrimage to the great wall or collect bibelots. As there is no great wall of China at Paris the true Parisian would only be bored by it. But to rummage among bric-à-brac shops, curiosity shops, and bazaars—that is the thing, the only thing, which they do in Pekin as in Paris. One saunters about,



stops before a stall, enters, falls into conversation with the merchant, and disputes the price of a cup or a flacon. For, as the reader will guess, there is no bric-à-brac in that part of the world but porcelains.

M. Vapereau became very well known to all the dealers of Pekin. He was at home in their shops, and occasionally they came to visit him, particularly when they had anything very extraordinary to sell. That is the only way to buy Chinese porcelains in China. People tell ridiculous stories about pitongs, potiches, and statuettes bought from this or that mandarin or great functionary of state. The doors of Chinese houses are hermetically closed to Europeans, though they be of rank and quality, and it is very difficult to make a lucky private purchase. Moreover, if the Chinese collect at all, it is only the rare pieces fabricated under such or such an emperor; which proves that to appreciate properly Chinese porcelains one must be born a Caucasian.

The antique types of these porcelains are becoming more and more rare. Formerly the Chinese allowed their pastes to ferment for years before using them. There is a legend to the effect that certain antique porcelains, very remarkable and much sought after, were obtained only by means of a paste which had been allowed to stand for a century! After this period, longer or shorter, of fermentation, the paste was divided into portions which were rolled and kneaded once more to drive out all air bubbles. After this, it was placed on the wheel. The vase or other object when formed roughly by the hand was allowed to dry slowly until the paste might be cut by a knife without its adhering to the blade. It was then turned according to a given profile.

The mark most sought for is the Chinese word "nien-hao" (number of years), which, like most Chinese terms, has many significations. It means that the piece will last long; it means, when added to an emperor's name, the period of his reign, and it is itself the name of the present ruler of China. Taken in connection with the name of any emperor it is generally held to signify that the piece was made in that potentate's reign; but this is, by no means, always the case.

At the present time the Chinese know very well the mercantile value of their wares. The large houses have their representatives in Paris. One of them, named Tien-Bao, attended the Vapereau sale, and noted down in his catalogue the prices brought by each article. So far as is known all the great amateurs in Pekin are Europeans. They are not many. M. Von Brandt, Dr. Bushell, of the English legation, Governor Brown, of Hong-Kong, and a few others fill the list. They soon learn to buy in the Chinese fashion, which is to offer about one-tenth of the sum asked, and then make a slight advance. The reason of this is that a Chinaman's most sacred rule is to preserve a good face in all his transactions. "How much for these two cups?" you ask him. "Five thousand francs." "I will give you two thousand." "Never." You go away and return in a few days. "Well, what do you say to two thousand and five francs for these two cups?" "I would lose money at two thousand." "Yes, but two thousand and five?" The five francs permits him to "keep his face"—to preserve his mercantile honor—and the bargain is made. The Chinaman does not like to appear to make concessions. If you wish him to do so you must allow him to "keep his face"—it is his term; if you will act so he can save appearances, all is well. We would add that there is no hypocrisy in all this. With a Chinaman reputation is the body of virtue, and he likes everything that is solid, tangible and visible. That is one of the main reasons why he makes such fine porcelains.

THE (London) Truth says: "What did not come out in the discussion about Sir Frederick Leighton's wall painting at South Kensington, for which we have just paid £3000, is that it is not a fresco, but an oil painting on a plaster wall or ground, and that three years is not enough to test the durability of a method which was condemned centuries ago by the Italian masters as one that would not stand even in their fine, pure climate. Leonardo's famous masterpiece at Milan was a ruin in less than fifty years. It certainly would not surprise me to find Sir Frederick Leighton's work in a similar plight in half that time, and long before then we may expect that the Minister of Works will be asked to put it under glass, like our other experimental wall paintings in the Houses of Parliament. Still, I suppose none of these productions is ever warranted sound; but, at any rate, if they go within the lifetime of the painter, he ought to be called to account,

and made to do his work in some better method. We know that Mr. Herbert renounced fresco in every form after painting his first great wall-picture, and that he has executed his second one recently placed on the wall of the Judgment Chamber of the House of Lords in oils upon canvas. Of this method there is abundant evidence of its durability up to four or five hundred years."

#### END OF THE FEUARDENT-CESNOLA TRIAL.

WHAT HAS BEEN PROVED CONCERNING THE COLLECTION OF CYPRIOTE ANTIQUITIES—MR. RUSSELL STURGIS CONTRADICTS MR. DI CESNOLA.

THOSE persons who looked forward to the "summing up" for a concise review of the testimony in the Feuardent-Di Cēsola libel suit with the desire to know what had actually been proved at the trial concerning the restorations and alterations of the collection of Cypriote antiquities, looked in vain. The judge, in his charge, ignored the archaeological aspects of the issue, and confined himself to the questions of libel involved in the defendant's angry rejoinder to the plaintiff's charge that objects in the collection had been ignorantly or fraudulently restored. On these questions of libel the jury found for the defendant on two of the three counts presented to them. On the other count they disagreed. The question to be determined in this count was whether Mr. Feuardent was entitled to damages on account of Mr. Di Cēsola's accusation that in their dealings in London he had overcharged him on an item for cartage, and, as his agent, had failed to make proper efforts to sell the Cypriote collection, which was subsequently bought by Mr. John Taylor Johnston, and is now owned by the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

The entire issues in the suit, so far as the public is interested, are succinctly and judicially summarized in the following editorial article, which appeared in *The Sun* on the day after the verdict. *The Sun* is the only New York newspaper, we believe, which had not hitherto expressed an opinion as to the merits of the controversy, and therefore this late utterance on the subject will have weight with persons who look for an unbiased judgment:

In *THE ART AMATEUR* of August, 1880, there appeared an article signed by Gaston L. Feuardent, in which, under the head of "Tampering with Antiquities," it was charged that, by various deceptive alterations and restorations, the archaeological value of certain objects in the collection of Cypriote antiquities belonging to the Metropolitan Museum of Art had been seriously impaired, if not totally destroyed. A few weeks after the appearance of this article Mr. L. P. Di Cēsola, the Director of the Museum and the reputed excavator of the Cypriote collection, declared in a letter to the newspapers that the charges were "maliciously made and absolutely without foundation in fact."

In October, 1880, Mr. Di Cēsola addressed a letter to the Executive Committee of the Museum Board of Trustees, in which he asked for an investigation of the matters alleged against his collection. At the request of the trustees, this duty was undertaken by President F. A. P. Barnard, Dr. Roswell D. Hitchcock, Judge Charles P. Daly, Mr. J. Q. A. Ward, and Mr. William C. Prime. These gentlemen, after what they termed a "thorough and exhaustive" investigation, found that "each and all of the charges are without foundation;" that if Mr. Di Cēsola had erred at all, it was "in too rigidly refraining from making repairs where correctness was reasonably certain," and that the Cēsola collection had passed through the ordeal of critical examination without a shadow cast on its reputation.

In the course of his letter inviting investigation, Mr. Di Cēsola had reflected seriously on the business rectitude as well as on the archaeological acumen of Mr. Feuardent. The latter, believing that the committee had not given him a fair opportunity to vindicate either, expanded and developed his charges in a series of cards addressed to the public, and published extracts from the letters of Mr. Di Cēsola to refute the accusations of commercial dishonesty which had been made against him. It was believed by many that these supplementary statements of Mr. Feuardent cast enough discredit on the findings of the Barnard committee, and suggested sufficient doubt as to the veracity of Mr. Di Cēsola, to warrant a new and more judicial investigation. That belief was not shared by the trustees of the museum, and finally, as the only means of securing a fair hearing, Mr. Feuardent took the matter into court in the form of an action for libel against Mr. Di Cēsola. The case was entered in the Superior Court in May, 1881, but when it was ready for trial before that tribunal it was, on the petition of the defendant setting forth that the plaintiff was an alien, transferred to the Circuit Court of the United States. It was placed on the calendar of that court in the fall of 1881, and its trial, after several postponements, was finally begun on the 31st of October last.

The complaint in the case alleged five separate causes of action, on each of which damages were claimed to the amount of \$5000. The complaint was really twofold, and involved a trial of the plaintiff's claim that he had been injured by the public declarations of the defendant; first, that he was a "public slanderer," a "thoroughly dishonest or thoroughly ignorant and reckless" man, and secondly, that he had not acted in good faith in dealing with part of the Cypriote collection while he had it under his care in London, and had made extortionate charges for its transport and custody. The defendant denied the injury, and undertook to prove the truth of his assertions, impugning the honesty and competency of Feuardent as an archaeologist and his trustworthiness as a man of business. The trial has, therefore, had two sides, only one of which can be said to possess public interest. The question of commercial honesty is mainly a personal one between Feuardent and Cēsola, though bearing directly on the credibility of both. The archaeological issues of the case concern not only the value of a costly and famous collection of antiquities, but bring under review the intelligence, good faith, and honesty of purpose of the management of a museum supported partly by the money of the tax-payers and partly by voluntary contributions.

The testimony produced in the case has conclusively demonstrated that the investigation of the Barnard committee was a sham. The statements of Mr. Di Cēsola, which that committee accepted as final, have been greatly modified by his evidence; the conclusions which they reached in regard to the seven statues specially examined by them, have, in nearly every case, been shown to be erroneous. The right hand holding the patera of statue No. 22 is found not to be "a solid, unbroken part of the statue against the side of which it is supported," but, on the contrary, it is attached to the statue by a wooden dowel. Instead of there being "no possible doubt," there is the gravest possible doubt of "the correct reunion" of the pieces composing No. 39; and the so-called "mirror" of the supposed Venus has certainly been touched by a modern hand to the extent of cutting a little under the ancient surface. These and other admissions equally fatal to the correctness of Mr. Di Cēsola's statements to the investigating committee and to the justice of their conclusions, are to be found in the defendant's own testimony.

Mr. Di Cēsola seems to have learned, during the last three years, so much about the restorations, repairs, and attachments to

which his collection has been subjected, as to warrant the suspicion that his archaeological conscience is not so sensitive as might be desired. The value of such a collection must depend largely on the scrupulous accuracy with which the place of discovery of the various objects is recorded. It has been shown in the course of this trial that several statues now credited to the Golgoi find were, by their discoverer, formerly placed elsewhere, and the general drift of the evidence has been to increase the difficulty of accepting Mr. Di Cēsola's account of the buried temple and its contents. That of the collection of statues about one-third had pieces detached and then stuck on again, and had the points of junction covered by a wash, is admitted by the defendant himself. That he has discovered the existence of several false noses since the report of the investigating committee is also admitted. To that extent, at least, Mr. Feuardent was entitled to the credit of contributing to the education of the director of the museum and its trustees. The question arises whether, in addition to this, he has proved the general allegation of one of the pamphlets for which he admits his responsibility, that "the statuary belonging to the Cēsola collection is largely made up of unrelated fragments, and few examples can be found that have not been repaired, restored, altered, added to, scraped, and painted." If for the last "and" in that statement be substituted "or," there can be no doubt about its truth. But the objects passed under review during the trial have not been numerous enough to establish so sweeping a conclusion as the literal significance of the allegation implies. Yet, deceptive "repairs," manifestly improper "restorations," misleading "attachments," and indefensible changes of surface have been conclusively proved in regard to about a dozen prominent objects in the collection, and the evidence exposes a good many more to at least a strong suspicion of being rendered valueless to the student or archaeologist by the perverted ingenuity of the modern restorer.

Of the changes made since the collection was transferred to the Central Park Mr. Di Cēsola accepts the responsibility and undertakes the defence. Of those made in Fourteenth Street, which seem to have been the least defensible, he denies the knowledge, and shifts the responsibility on others. According to his testimony it was Mr. Russell Sturgis who directed the repairs and restorations made by Gehlen in the old museum; according to Mr. Sturgis this statement is "absolutely and wholly false." At every turn of the evidence, we are confronted with just such contradictions as that which Mr. Sturgis has taken the trouble to swear to in Florence, and the general impression left by that evidence must depend greatly on the estimate formed of Mr. Di Cēsola's regard for the truth. On this must largely depend the question of whether the Cypriote collection is hopelessly discredited by the results of the trial. A direct issue of credibility has been raised between Cēsola and nearly every witness called on the side of the plaintiff. The presumption against the defendant's consistent truthfulness is certainly increased by such voluntary testimony as that of Mr. Sturgis, which was not in the trial at all. But if Cēsola's word is of dubious value, how are the public to know whether the restorations and repairs made in New York are not merely the continuation of a long series of similar "improvements" begun in Cyprus? Sculptors and stone-masons of experience have failed to discover the true character of some of the later restorations, even when these were made of materials easily separable from the stone. There is some ground for belief that broken noses and limbs were mended in Cyprus by repairers a good deal more skilful than Gehlen or Balliard. The former seem to have used an amalgam of greater density than the limestone to which it is applied. The stone yields to the action of acid more readily than this tenacious cement. It may, therefore, be quite possible to acquit Mr. Di Cēsola of any personal knowledge of the work of repair to which some of the objects in his collection were subjected before they came into his hands. He was not fastidious about the means employed to acquire possession of the remains of Cypriote art, and he was not scrupulously exact in assigning a locality to the objects which he bought or dug up. If he was a party to what he probably regarded as trivial deception on others, it is no less likely that he was himself deceived.

The difficulty in regard to the collection, or about a great deal of the evidence which has been elicited on the trial, is to know where deception ends and truth begins. That fact may commend the Cypriote antiquities in the Museum of Art to the future notice of the curiosity seeker, but it will seriously prejudice any claim they may have had to the respectful consideration of the student of art or archaeology.

After all the testimony on both sides was in, new light was thrown upon the credibility of the statements of Mr. Di Cēsola by the publication, in *The Evening Post*, of the following letter then just received from Florence, from the well-known architect, Mr. Russell Sturgis, upon whom Mr. Di Cēsola had tried to fasten the responsibility for the patch-work done in Fourteenth Street by the cabinet-maker, Gehlen—"that excellent German artist" as he calls him in one of his letters to Mr. Hutchins.

In the reports of the Feuardent-Cēsola suit, session of the 20th of December, Gen. Di Cēsola is quoted as saying, in answer to questions by jurors, "Russell Sturgis is mainly responsible for Gehlen's repairs and restorations." I have written to Gen. Di Cēsola, calling his attention to this report, and begging him to contradict it, supposing, as I must, that his words have been incorrectly reported. But, as I am so far away, I cannot well await his answer before taking other steps to contradict the statement ascribed to him.

For that statement is wholly untrue. I never had anything to do with any of Mr. Gehlen's work upon the sculptures of the Cēsola collection.

At the time of the unpacking of the first Cēsola collection I was a trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and a member of the Executive Committee. The Douglas mansion, in West Fourteenth Street, had been hired for the museum, and I had volunteered to superintend the alterations necessary to fit that house and its appendages for the uses of the museum. As regards the repairs or restorations, the mounting and placing of the sculptures, I often conversed with Gen. Di Cēsola, exactly as any other member of the Board of Trustees might have done. But I never had given to me, nor assumed, any authority over these matters. I never directed any repairs, nor advised any, nor influenced, nor sought to influence in any way, the manner or extent of repairing or restoration. And the statement copied above from the Tribune of the 21st December is absolutely and wholly false.

I have made a similar declaration upon oath before the Consul of the United States at this place, and have sent it to New York, where it can be used if needed.

This communication hardly surprised the friends of the plaintiff in the suit; but it evidently made a profound impression on the associates of Mr. Sturgis in the museum, knowing as they do the unimpeachable integrity of that gentleman. Unfortunately, the letter was legally inadmissible. The public, however, may compare it with the following extract from the printed testimony of the defendant, Di Cēsola, to which it refers:

Q.—Who was this Mr. Sturgis of whom you speak? A.—He was one of the trustees in charge of the building arrangement in Fourteenth Street; I suppose he was especially in charge of it, but I am not sure; as I say, I was not connected with it.

## Correspondence.

Q.—Mr. Russell Sturgis? A.—He was, in fact, the man from whom I had to get my orders.

Q.—Were any of the other trustees active in that same matter? A.—There was Mr. Prime, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Weston, Mr. Rhinelander, and Mr. Hoe, Jr.

Q.—Now, in regard to Mr. Gehlen's work there—what had you to do with that? A.—Mr. Gehlen was employed by the trustees; I had nothing to do with it; I did not know the man before I went there; I found him put in charge there, and Mr. Sturgis said: "This is the man I employed to make all repairs that he wants to your statutory, so it can go up-stairs and be placed on exhibition;" I took it for granted that the man knew his business, and I merely pointed out the pieces and told him how they should be repaired and put together; I told him, however, that nothing should be made permanent, as the collection was going to be put on exhibition temporarily only in that building.

A juror—I should like to ask whether this statue of Hercules, when this statue was restored, was restored in Mr. Di Cesnola's presence, or whether he knew of its being done?

Q.—Were you present when it was done? A.—No, sir; it was done in Fourteenth Street, in the other building.

Q.—(By a juror)—Were you in this country at the time? A.—Yes, sir; I was here at that time, but I did not know of it.

(2854) Q.—Was it done clandestinely? A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—(By a juror)—Was it done by your orders? A.—Not at that time; I was not connected with the museum at that time. I did have instructions to see that repairs were properly made of everything; but I went away afterward, and what was done during that time I do not know; I cannot say whether it was on exhibition in Fourteenth Street or not; I don't know. The repairer was appointed by the trustees; Mr. Sturgis appointed him, and I was merely a stranger there.

Q.—I would like to ask you a question, and I would like to have you give me a direct answer to the question. Did you, concerning that statue, give Mr. Gehlen any directions whatever? A.—I have not the slightest recollection.

Q.—You did give him some general directions to repair, did you not? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You do not wish to be responsible for the condition of that statue, but you desire to place the responsibility upon Mr. Sturgis, do you? A.—To a certain extent, yes, sir.

Q.—Did he give Mr. Gehlen directions to make that repair? A.—That I don't know; as a general thing he did not.

Q.—Did you hear Mr. Sturgis give any directions whatever to Mr. Gehlen about repairing statues? A.—Yes, sir, I did; Mr. Gehlen depended upon him.

Q.—Then Mr. Gehlen was not responsible to you? A.—No, sir.

(2856) Q.—Is it your wish and understanding—is it your wish that the jury should understand—that you do not consider yourself responsible for anything that Mr. Gehlen did? A.—Most certainly; I want to be responsible for the work done in Central Park after I was made director, but not for the work done in Fourteenth Street by Gehlen. I am not responsible for that.

Q.—(By Mr. Choate)—Did I understand you to say that you remember no particular instruction given by anybody about this statue? A.—None whatever.

Q.—Mr. Gehlen, not being responsible to you, you never interfered or meddled with him in any way, did you? A.—I do not understand what you mean.

Q.—Was he independent of you? Witness—Meddled with what?

Counsel—Did you ever interfere or attempt to control him? A.—No, sir; certainly not. I had no power to control him.

## THE NEW VOLUME OF "L'ART."

WITH the present year the great artistic periodical enters on a new career which will make it more popular and more useful than ever. Its publishers anxious to reduce the price so as to bring the work within the reach of a much greater circle of readers, have hit on the very sensible plan of publishing fortnightly, instead of weekly parts, and half yearly, instead of quarterly volumes. This change will permit of greater attention being given to the letter-press and to the plates, which last though wonderfully successful as a rule in the past, have at times, as we have pointed out suffered from hurry both in the execution and the printing. It is bad policy and bad art to use etching as a means of illustration merely; yet many of the etchings of L'Art have been mere illustrations of places or things, and have had little or no artistic merit. But with weekly issues it has been impossible to avoid printing such etchings occasionally. We may now hope that we have seen the last of them. In the matter of price, as the bulk of the work will be much reduced though its quality will be bettered, the publishers find themselves in a position to make its cost to the reader much less than it has been. It may be had from Bouton for twelve dollars.

The last quarterly volume, now to be had at Bouton's, contains the conclusion of the remarkable series of articles on the Della Robbia family, finely illustrated with wood engravings and an excellent etching by Edmond Ramus of Giovanni della Robbia's Sta. Lucia, and another by Louis Rouet of the same master's Tabernacle delle Fontecina at Florence. This last etching reminds one of some of Jacquemart's best works. The account of Claude Lorraine and his works is continued and finely illustrated, and so is that of Lebrun and his masterpieces of decoration and architecture. The works of the late Ulysse Butin, C. A. Sellier, and the living artists represented in the Salon are among the modern themes treated. Other articles of interest are those on the celebrated wax bust of the musée Wicar, on the international exhibition of Munich, on Matteo Civitali, on the works of Fra Angelico at Rome, and on M. Burty's publication of the Japanese Romance O Koma, with illustrations by Felix Regamey. Some of these pictures after the Japanese are reproduced, and they are very clever and very unsatisfactory.

It is to be noted that no change is to be made in the publication of the "Courrier de l'Art," which will continue to give weekly all the news of the studios, sales and exhibitions, as before, and thus nothing of any value will be lost sight of owing to the less frequent appearance of "L'Art."

THE dominion of Canada stands in urgent need, says The Montreal Gazette, of a coat-of-arms. It is now destitute. It requires a proper heraldic symbol that may express the broad idea of Canadian unity and embody the main facts of Canadian history. We call the attention of artists and literateurs to this subject. As an indication of the kind of article demanded, we would suggest, adds The Gazette, that the shield be in plain white ground, "semée" with golden fleur-de-lis. Upon this should be a single red lion passant. This simple device would condense into one emblem the main facts of our political history. Our present shield has no supporter. These are usually found upon important armorial bearings, when they are drawn in full detail. For these the moose and the bison might well be taken to typify the Western prairie land and the Eastern Provinces, and they would make expressive and picturesque supporters. The crest is a more difficult point; it might be a lion's head crowned. This would repeat the monarchical idea expressed by the red lion taken from the British shield. Such a shield as this, easily drawn and easily remembered, would be reproduced all over the land, and would speedily become familiar alike to the youth of the sea-coasts, the lake regions and the prairie lands, who would unconsciously learn to think that they too had a united country with a continuous history.

## ARTISTIC HOMES AT REASONABLE COST.

SIR: Can you recommend an architect of your city who will design for me a private dwelling-house to cost from \$50,000 to \$60,000? Can I not build a beautiful, comfortable, artistic home for that money and not wait until the cattle on my husband's ranche multiply and multiply and give me a million to put into a horrid palace? Can I not have a ceiling from La Farge, an "interior" from Herter? or are they only for people of immense wealth? And when I am ready to furnish it, may I not come to see you and persuade you to tell me who, where and what?

ANSWER.—You can build for the sum you name, a good, commodious, and thoroughly artistic house, with many of the novel and quaint features which go far to make one's abode beautiful. "A ceiling from La Farge" or "an interior from Herter" are not attainable in your case, and you can do very well without them. Of course considerable information is necessary to enable an architect to prepare plans for your approval. For example, you must give him some idea of the ground upon which you purpose building; say whether, for instance, it is flat or hilly, and whether or not there are trees or shrubs on it.

State also of what material the better houses in your city are built. Give some idea of the rooms you will require; for instance, do you need a nursery, and how many servants' rooms? All information of this nature will be of great assistance to the architect in preparing plans, and will save expense and loss of time in making alterations. A house built in the modern "Queen Anne" style, with the first story of stone or brick and the rest of the construction in timbers, would probably suit your purpose best. Any letter that you or others similarly situated may send, will be promptly placed in the hands of an experienced architect of excellent taste and moderate in his charges.

## TREATMENT OF DINING-ROOM WALLS.

SIR: Will you have the kindness to suggest treatment for walls of a dining-room (with the woodwork), which has two windows facing south, a large old-fashioned fireplace, and oak furniture?

ANSWER.—The ceiling may be colored a deep sage green, divided into panels by a flat oak moulding with reed edges; the cornice a dark old oak tint, with cove (if any) deep dead crimson. Have a frieze 2½ feet deep of deep tawny red, painted under the cornice on the face of the wall, with an oak picture-rod 3 inches deep at the lower edge. The rest of the wall surface may be painted a rich gold olive with damask ornament, stencilled on in deeper shades of the same color—or use a quiet self-colored paper of simple pattern and free from gold. If you use paper it should be of the same color as recommended for painting, namely, golden olive in tone. Let the woodwork be painted a deep antique oak color, so as to accord with the furniture. The door panels may be rather darker than the styles, but under no consideration must any graining be allowed. Your curtains may be deep tawny red of some heavy material.

A more expensive and much handsomer treatment would be to have the room ceiled with thin oak boarding, stained and oiled, with dividing styles and cornice made massive in treatment, and heavily moulded, of the same wood. The wall treatment could then be entirely tawny red, omitting the picture strip, and having a five feet high wainscot, panelled, and with a wide shelf on top, upon which vases, plaques, and other ornaments and bric-à-brac might be placed. With this treatment the woodwork of doors and windows must be changed to oak, and the curtains should be of an olive shade and made of rich, heavy material.

## A MASONIC LODGE CEILING.

SIR: Please answer the following question, as it is of importance to the satisfaction of a Masonic fraternity here who are now having their lodge-room decorated. The ceiling contains a large stucco centre-piece of roses and leaves. Would it be proper and correct in design to finish a circular panel around this stucco in imitation of a sky, with clouds? If you can answer this by mail you will confer a great favor on many interested parties in this city. Could you refer me to some work that would treat on such matters?

ANSWER.—The treatment proposed would be exceedingly incongruous, in the worst possible taste, and contrary to every principle of surface decoration. If the ceiling is large it should be divided into panels by bands or borders of quiet ornamentation, and the centre-piece alluded to painted and bronzed in such a way as to be in harmony with the rest of the ceiling decoration, but not made obtrusive or conspicuous by excessive enrichment. Definite advice as to the proper decoration of this ceiling cannot be given without a full description of the walls and woodwork, and the proposed treatment of the same. We know of no books which would be of aid in this matter. The better plan would be to have a colored design made by some competent person.

## THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM TECHNICAL ART SCHOOLS.

STUDENT, Brooklyn.—Write to Mr. J. Ward Stimson, the manager, inclosing a stamp for a circular of particulars. His address is 214 East 34th Street, New York. It is the aim of these schools "to furnish facilities to hitherto attainable in this country to artists and artisans; to provide thorough technical instruction in painting, decoration, designing, modelling, carving, free-hand, architectural, instrumental, and perspective drawing; also in carriage drafting and construction as a specialty, and to furnish an acquaintance with the theory and practice of the arts." The fees charged are small, and intended only to cover the cost of materials used.

## PAINTING ON GLASS.

E. P. T., Newcastle, Pa.—The process of painting on glass is a more serious undertaking than you seem to imagine. White, yellow, gray or green rolled glass is used, but white rolled glass only for parts to be painted. Special colors, composed of oxides and other pigments which will melt and become suffused when subject to a certain degree of heat, are prepared for glass painting. They may be bought of J. Marsching & Co., 27 Park Place, New York. These colors are sold as powders, and must be ground exceedingly fine; they are then mixed with a little fat oil, and made into a paste, which is diluted with turpentine until it becomes a fluid, the color being worked and mixed the whole time by the palette knife. The powders make the stains. Enamel colors are used for enriching the painting. They are made from mineral oxides and mixed with a flux; they are sold ready prepared and diluted, and mixed like the powder colors.

Badger brushes are used for laying on what is called the "mat" or rough ground for the paint to hold on, and for all large surfaces of color; sable and camel-hair brushes for outlining and small painting; scrubs for taking off the mat, and thus producing the high lights of the pictures. Etching tools are used for forming diaper patterns upon drapery or backgrounds, by scratching off the colors so as to make a design. The "matting" process consists in grinding up some pale shade of color with a few drops of gum, washing this thinly over the whole glass, and working it about so as to spread the color evenly over every part. This matting is allowed to dry before painting is proceeded with.

## A NOVICE ADVISED.

SIR: I am twenty-one years old, and have always wished to study art. I have drawn more or less since I can remember. My family were opposed to it, and put me in a store when I was very young, and I have been in active business ever since. During the last year I could control my desire for art no longer, and I have drawn and painted some—when I could afford the time—with very good success. I can draw a very fair likeness of myself from looking in a mirror. I have saved about \$300, and am undecided of three things which to do—whether to go to New York and get a position in a store, which I can easily do through influence, and study art a good deal from observation, or to attend some art school in New York, or else to go to Europe, on an economical plan, see the art treasures the old world possesses, and trust to luck for instruction. What do you advise?

J. P. S., Big Rapids, Mich.

ANSWER.—If it is necessary for you to support yourself while studying, your best plan would be to come to New York and take a position in a store at first, so as to be sure of a regular income, and then to study art in some good night class, at the Art Students' League, for instance, where the charges are reasonable—\$8 a month by the season. Your \$300 it would be well to put in a savings bank as a nucleus for a fund with which to go to Europe later, as it would be of no avail whatever for you to go now without any previous study; and even on the most economical basis your \$300 would last a very short time. A good education in art is not to be acquired by mere observation, and "trusting to luck" will not be found a very available method of studying. No matter what natural talent you may have, it is useless without careful training, and it is best to begin at the beginning, studying drawing from the cast in charcoal and afterward from the life.

## CHINA FIRING.

SIR: (1) In painting dessert plates ("Kappa" designs) should the design be painted and fired before the ground color is put on? Would the second firing affect the delicate tints of the flowers, or, in other words, are underglaze colors affected by refiring? (2) Can you recommend a trustworthy place for firing china? I have tried several, and found them not only extremely careless, but dishonest.

T. W., Charleston, S. C.

ANSWER.—(1) It is not necessary to have the design fired separately; the ground may be painted in and the whole fired together. Some tints come out too light after one firing, and have to be fired again; if the colors are put on properly this re-firing will not affect them unfavorably, but is rather an advantage. (2) Ulrich's, at Fourth Avenue and Twelfth Street, New York, is a good place to leave china for firing. They do not do it themselves, but have it very carefully done. John Bennett, 4 Great Jones Street, New York, also exercises great care in firing china for amateurs.

## PAINTING IN BLACK AND WHITE OILS.

SIR: How are those oil paintings, made that look like steel-engravings?

REX REGI, Newton, Iowa.

ANSWER.—The paintings you refer to are probably those done in black and white oil which, when finely finished and framed in a mat, have much the appearance of an engraving. To paint in this way use simply ivory black and silver white (or any other good white). No other colors are necessary. Either poppy or linseed oil is used for a medium. The painting is done on canvas, like any other oil painting, and when finished may be varnished with French retouching varnish.

## PAINTING ON VELLUM.

F. B. H., Albany, N. Y.—Use either moist water-colors mixed with Chinese white, or powder colors mixed with Canada balsam. The latter produces the best effects, but is somewhat troublesome. Damp the skin and stretch it in an open wooden frame so that it is free upon both sides. Dust it over with powdered chalk, which remove quickly. Transfer the design to the vellum with tracing paper and red carbonized paper, and mark it in very lightly and without pressing the vellum where no guiding lines are required. It is better to sketch in the design with a lead-pencil than to trace it, if the worker can do so without erasures. While painting, keep tissue paper between the hand and the vellum to counteract any heat from the hand, or use the wooden rest required in china painting. Gild the vellum with the best gold-leaf before coloring, if a gold background is required, and work over the gilding with color. Leaves, scrolls, and other small articles are gilded separately, and before any coloring is applied. Work with the best powder colors, and with cadmium for yellow, ultramarine for blue, carmine, pure scarlet and vermilion for red, mineral green and chromes for green, ivory black and Chinese white. Use water-color size to make the tints run more easily.

## THE "COSMOPHOS" PROCESS.

ARTHUR C., Toledo, O.—This is a process lately introduced in England, by means of which it is claimed that the amateur is enabled to produce from the same original photograph, drawing, etching, engraving, or woodcut, any number of transparent pictures on glass plates prepared for the purpose. These pictures can be finished either in monochrome, and simply varnished; or in monochrome with glass color for firing, or they can be painted in transparent oil colors. The process is described as follows by The (London) Artist: "The original to be reproduced is rendered transparent by rubbing over the back surface with the transparent medium; this will not occupy more than a minute. The milky-looking surface of the prepared glass plate must then be well cleaned with spirits, and rubbed dry with a clean cloth. Darken the room, and in semi-darkness cover the glass plate with an even surface of the sensitive medium. Place the plate thus prepared on a moderately heated tile or slab for a few minutes until it is dry. Place the copy frame open and with the glass downward before you; lay the transparent picture on the frame glass, and on it the now dried glass plate, with the sensitive (yellow) surface against the picture. Close the frame and expose the picture to the sun or daylight for two to ten minutes, according to the brightness of the light, until the edges of the glass not covered by the picture take a brown tint. Then take the frame back to the darkened room, remove cautiously the plate from the opened frame and picture, and rub some of the powder color No. 1 with a soft brush repeatedly over the glass plate, when the picture is finished."